

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

Another Look at Disarmament

One possible avenue of discussion opened up by the Khrushchev visit was in the armaments field. As Professor Walt Rostow of M.I.T. indicates in *The Economist* (London), some economic planners consider that the Soviet Union has come to a fork-in-the-road. If its economic development is to go forward and progress be made in transportation and the consumer goods sector, Khrushchev must find ways of cutting back on the present staggering proportions of military expenditures.

Some observers view his speech to the UN General Assembly in this context. They believe that necessity and ambition drive Khrushchev to assume the mantle of peacemaker. He would like to be known as the architect of a better life for the Russian people. However, others see his sweeping proposals as only another melancholy chapter in the long procession of failures in the disarmament field.

The dual question that arises is whether states engaged in this deadly arms race are capable of settling their disputes through peaceful means and whether present day international institutions are adequate to the purpose. We will look at the two phases of the question separately.

Critics of the Western policy of building up "situations of strength" frequently assert that an armaments race inevitably leads to war. The annals of international relations provide some support for this doctrine. Rival states that pile weapon on weapon frequently have crossed the threshold of overt military conflict. One thing men cannot do with bayonets, someone has observed, is to sit on them.

But states that fail to make adequate military preparations have likewise been the victim of warfare and aggression. Hitler might not have been tempted to march boldly from military threat to open aggression if the will and capacity to resist him had been made apparent.

Negotiations move forward successfully when both sides see reasons for pursuing their goals by peaceful means. Historically this is associated with a more or less equal distribution of power. Since World War II we can discover straws in the wind that suggest the Soviet Union has been more amenable to reason and diplomacy when the West was strong and not weak. Similarly, the recent posture of jaunty self-confidence and bold expansiveness of Soviet leaders is probably a result of the relative decline of Western power in recent years.

Armament negotiations historically have floundered because states have had conflicting objectives and differing armament systems. Every nation in creating national strength turns to those forms of armament best suited to its resources. Having done so it then finds it difficult to limit itself in the fields of its greatest potential. In this way the building up of particular forms of strength on both sides becomes an obstacle to agreement.

For instance, in the era of the so-called American atomic monopoly following World War II, the Soviets called for "banning the bomb"—an understandable objective inasmuch as such a program would have left their own superior land armies intact. In the era of sputnik and lunik, however, the first step in Premier Khrushchev's disarmament

Vol. XIX No. 18, November 2, 1959 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

scheme calls for reduction of conventional armaments. A ceiling would be established for Soviet, American, British and French ground troops and only later would the Soviet plan control and limit the more novel weapons. The shift in the sources of Soviet power has conditioned its arms policies.

Salvador de Madariaga tells a fable about an animal disarmament conference that he attributes to Winston S. Churchill.

"When the animals had gathered, the lion looked at the eagle and said gravely, 'We must abolish talons.' The tiger looked at the elephant and said, 'We must abolish tusks.' The elephant looked back at the tiger and said, 'We must abolish claws and jaws.'

"Thus each animal in turn proposed the abolition of the weapons he did not have, until at last the bear rose up and said in tones of sweet reasonableness: 'Comrades, let us abolish everything—everything but the great universal embrace.'"

Madariaga told this fable in answer to the Soviet delegate to the League of Nations, Maxim Litvinov, who, in February 1932, startled the world with a far-reaching proposal for total disarmament. The story has been cited as relevant to Khrushchev's yet more ambitious plan.

Thus the disarmament policies of each nation reflect its interests and objective military and political positions. This has always made compromise and agreement on armaments more difficult since modern states seek security through the military establishments that best meet their strategic needs. When approached to reduce forces-in-being, they must ask themselves at least two questions. First, how will the proposed changes affect their relative power position vis-a-vis other states? Secondly, has there been sufficient relaxation of tension to warrant their reducing military forces? Americans often forget that disarmament is not the prelude but the result of an easing of the political struggle.

These facts and the unique nature of every nation's armaments system sets limits to a successful approach to disarmament. The armaments race is a symptom not the cause of tensions among nations. Where underlying tensions have been reduced, as they were in the nineteenth century in the boundary disputes between Canada and the United States, negotiators are enabled to move on to the next step of an understanding over armaments—in this case the Rush-Bagot agreement.

The absence of such progress in the political

field has frustrated Soviet-American efforts to disarm since the political accommodation that must precede advance on any arms reduction has been lacking. And now the Khrushchev proposals ignore the necessity of proceeding step-by-step. (While the Russians have conceded that a program of disarmament by stages may be required, they have done nothing to point up the steps toward this goal.)

Now to return to the phase of our question that deals with the adequacy of international institutions. Sometimes it is said that disarmament would be possible if we had effective world organizations. The best informed students of diplomacy insist, however, that disarmament or peaceful settlement depends less upon the adequacy of international institutions and more upon the will and national interests of states. Within or outside the UN, ample and appropriate agencies for arms control and agreement exist. Geneva provides another forum for negotiations on atomic energy and such technical problems as surprise attack and early warning systems.

The substance rather than the form of negotiations is important and the channels for discussion are more than sufficient. Indeed the twentieth century may suffer from the illusion that international institutions of themselves assure peace. On the contrary, institutions are merely the forum within which conflicting foreign policy goals may be harmonized—a task in the final analysis for diplomacy and statecraft.

The great unanswered question at the moment is whether the unprecedented character of thermonuclear weapons has changed the lessons of history on disarmament. In the past, every attempt has failed primarily because armaments are means and not ends, instruments in power struggles that too often remain unresolved, elements relative to the strength and prestige of nations that can be sacrificed only at national peril.

Perhaps new areas exist in which common, equal and overriding interests that would dictate an arms reduction can be found. Continuing the present year-old moratorium on nuclear testing may exemplify this hope. Conceivably the British, Russians and Americans can afford to accept limitations on unlimited testing without endangering their national security or prestige.

Even this is a question that must be continually under review. Beyond it, the margins within which disarmament talks can proceed are far nar-

rower than implied by Khrushchev's proposal. We must be particularly wary of approaching the problems on an all-or-nothing basis or with "a universal embrace."

K. W. T.

UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

IN EDITORIALS and articles this journal has made much of the fact that there is today in the Roman Catholic Church a very serious attempt to develop a doctrine of religious liberty that is consistent in principle with democracy. The traditional view has assumed that the ideal type of society would involve a confessional Catholic state that would give special privileges to the Church and restrict the freedom of non-Catholic religious minorities.

It has often been said by Roman Catholic theorists of the traditional type that this idea of the confessional state is the "thesis" and that the necessary adjustment to the conditions of a religiously pluralistic society is what they call a "hypothesis," that this adjustment is a second best, a pragmatic step that in no way annuls the principle of the confessional state.

The hopeful fact to which we have often called attention is that there are many Roman Catholic thinkers in this country and in Europe who insist that in principle a situation of full religious liberty is actually better than a confessional state that restricts the liberty of non-Catholics, that support of this principle of religious freedom should be the "thesis." It has been difficult to evaluate the strength in the Church of those who hold this new view but there has been no question about their theological competence. When we have called attention to their presence in the Church, to the work of such men as Father John Courtney Murray and Father Gustav Weigel, critics often warn that thinkers of their type are not the Church and that their position is likely to be ineffective in the end.

We here call attention to a remarkable article in *The Ecumenical Review* (July 1, 1959) which documents at length the great strength of this more liberal view in Europe. The author, Dr. A. F. Carrillo De Albornoz, is a consultant for the World Council of Churches on religious liberty. He has a very profound knowledge of Roman Catholicism and his testimony is quite authoritative. We quote the summarizing passages which are supported by many references to the literature:

Roman Catholic literature representing this modern tendency has lately been so voluminous and of such a quality that it would be

an understatement to say that for *one* book or article in favor of the traditional doctrine *ten* have been published defending universal religious freedom as "Thesis;" and we should note that they have all been published with the *nihil obstat* of the Roman Catholic authorities. As is well known, the *nihil obstat* does not always mean that the book approved reflects exactly the Roman Catholic doctrine on the matter, but it does always mean that nothing in such a book is against the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church.

Owing precisely to the overflowing nature of this literature, we can take only very brief notice of it. Nevertheless, we wish to emphasize that the great majority of theologians representing the new tendency belong to countries having a Roman Catholic majority or, at least, where Protestants are certainly a minority, as for instance, France, Belgium, Austria, Portugal, West Germany and even Spain and Italy. (pp.408-9)

At a later point in the article the author says that "Roman Catholics who defend religious liberty are convinced that the recent Popes, Pius XI, Pius XII and John XXIII, are sympathetic with their theory" (p. 415).

We know that the Roman Catholic Church is divided from top to bottom on this subject, that the traditional theory is ably challenged. It is reassuring to American Protestants that the Roman Catholics who believe in universal religious liberty on principle have as much support in Europe as this article indicates.

J. C. B.

A FRAUDULENT CONSPIRACY

AT THIS WRITING the massed manpower of American journalism would seem to be engaged in a massive manhunt. "Where's Charlie?" has become the cry of the pack. It seems that a young instructor of English at Columbia University, named Charles Van Doren, is lost, and the very foundations of the Republic are shaking.

All of this furious pursuit relates to a series of revelations that have emerged over the past two years concerning the rigging of television quiz shows. The revelations have come from talkative contestants, tipsters, newspaper exposés and district attorney's investigations. Six months ago a New York County grand jury went into the whole matter and had its finding impounded; the obvious conclusion had to be that there was insufficient evidence to indict anyone for a crime. Then Congress got into the act and is currently questioning the question-men. Its theoretical purpose:

to see if legislation is needed to assert some measure of control over television contests.

It appears that we have been deceived. Now it can be told. Houdini did not really pull rabbits out of hats. The medicine show's elixir does not really restore our youth. It ain't necessarily so that Winstons taste good, as cigarettes should. Some wrestling bouts are "fixed." Apparently the cerebral exhibitionists cheated a little as they flexed their cortical muscles. And there isn't any Santa Claus.

We have been deceived! Show business, whether staged by the broadcasting networks, the Messrs. Barry and Enright, or Congressional investigating committees, is not averse to a little deception if it serves the immediate purpose.

Perhaps chasing Charlie is the way to solve this fraud. Perhaps a few contempt or perjury prosecutions. Perhaps a new directive to the Federal Communications Commission, or a law controlling the content of television programs, or a tightening of regulations through existing laws governing commercial advertising. Some of these steps will undoubtedly be taken.

A too hasty turning to some of these regulatory devices is no more to be desired than the evils they are intended to correct. The FCC itself is too lately out of the scandal thicket to justify much public confidence. The bright light of exposure is the best defense. When the public knows the full facts it refuses to be fooled, and the quiz shows are off the air.

The larger scandal revealed in this whole ex-

posure is the corrosion of honor and integrity in so much of American commercial life. The fraud and the lie and the deception pollute the stream of human communication. The mass audience is held in utter contempt by the persuaders, the sellers, the packagers. Sponsors, producers, networks and the pitiful contestants who acquiesce are all part of the same cynical system—this is the moral outrage. Property rights take precedence at all points over human rights and human values.

The controversy has shown that television is not a medium for creative art, certainly not a voice for morality in the nation's living rooms. It is an amoral, money-making medium, franchised by the people for use in the public interest.

Something more is involved here than the innocent deception that a sophisticated society would permit in its music halls and on television screens. This was a fraudulent conspiracy for purposes of using the public for commercial ends. Intellectual skill and honor were cynically used as if they were actors' greasepaint or part of the dramatic fiction. Everybody read his lines.

The crux of the deception was that precious values—the public's respect for honesty, truth and the free intellect—were taken and turned against the public over the very airwaves that the public owns. Such perversions conjure up too many frightening prospects to suit us, prospects of what could happen to political persuasion, propaganda, advertising, all human communication.

R. T. B.

World Religions and World Affairs

PAUL GEREN

THE CHRISTIAN WEST is currently challenged at many points by a resurgence of the religions of the East and Near East. Some of this renaissance is obviously little more than an emotional fervor stimulated by the surging nationalism of the countries in which these religions are dominant. However, it is quite clear that on the whole it is more than that.

Western intellectuals have for many years taken seriously the Eastern religions. With the great increase in cultural exchange and contact it is not

surprising to find popular interest in them also growing.

Up to this point, however, there have been few attempts in this country to consider how these different religions might approach common world problems. One recent move in this direction brought Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jews and Muslims from twenty-odd countries together for discussion across doctrinal lines. Meeting in Dallas under the auspices of the Dallas Council on World Affairs, the participants dealt with many questions in the political, economic and religious fields.

Mr. Geren has had wide experience as diplomat and educator. He is the author of *The Burma Diary*.

Neutralism: The Patient Long Look

Politically considered, the conference might be viewed as an effort by some of the Buddhists and fewer Hindus and Muslims to articulate a religious basis for neutralism. The word itself was scarcely heard. What they believe in requires a somewhat longer phrase: the right to try to get on in the Cold War without committing themselves to either side at present.

One of the Buddhist participants offered the most forthright basis for such a position:

Every religion has a basic foundation in an eternal law, an eternal God or an eternal power. . . . We find it quite easy to understand the differences of opinions of others . . . India, Ceylon, Burma and other countries have been mainly responsible for a policy of mutual understanding, this policy of non-alignment with power blocs. . . . It has a religious and philosophical background. . . . We are not anti-one side or pro-one side. That is what Buddhism teaches.

A statement by a representative of Hinduism addressed to a similar point suggested that *Ahimsa* and the patient long look inculcated by belief in reincarnation could be of aid in our time of threatened nuclear war:

Here then is a situation that demands the utmost of patience and a long view, a situation in which we must be ever prepared to take the initiative for peace and mutual understanding without yielding to either impatience or despair, without succumbing to either indifference or cynicism in regard to that which we hold to be right or to take fretful and dangerous short-cuts that corrupt the very ends we seek to serve.

The Muslims did not seem so much concerned with a religious basis for neutralism. While Indonesia espouses positive neutralism and several of the Arab states practice a neutralism of advantage, Pakistan, the most populous of Muslim states, is a member of SEATO. The political consciousness of Muslims, especially the Arab Muslims, was turned in the direction of Algeria. Here they urged another variety of positive neutralism: If tyranny is wrong in Hungary, it is likewise wrong in Algeria; if you condemn persecution in Tibet, you must also condemn it in Algeria.

Notwithstanding these varieties of so-called neutralism, the Buddhists, Hindus and Muslims made it clear that they were opposed to communism on metaphysical and practical grounds.

Let us remember also that the ways of God are mysterious, that the seed of liberty is planted so deeply and firmly in human nature that it will flower forth in the most unexpected quarters. (Comment from a Hindu)

A Buddhist feels that a man is a distinct entity . . . his will cannot be subordinate to anybody else. (Comment from a Buddhist)

Islam endows a Muslim with the power of self-government. Islam is democratic in character and holds sacred individual and public liberty. . . . Liberty is the fundamental foundation of the Islamic society. (Comment from a Muslim)

The Renunciation of Things

In the economic sphere, the principal emphases were that economic development is not contrary to the teachings of the great religions, that economic assistance is an appropriate field for expressing brotherly concern, and that materialism is a peril for all, especially for wealthy people and nations, whether materialism is organized in a philosophical system or practiced in daily life.

The concern of Christianity with a better economic life for all people has been demonstrated in theology and practice. The interest of Buddhists and Hindus in the relationship between their faith and economic development was new to some of us.

The following quotations from addresses at the conference are clear illustrations of this growing interest.

I would boldly assert that the newly emergent nations of Southeast Asia of whatever religious philosophy, find the principle of economic development in itself to hold no hazard for the practice and the promotion of their national religious ideals. (Comment from a Buddhist)

In the relations between the rich and the poor, between countries where skills and capital are plentiful and where they are not, there is, of course, a great deal of scope for the exercise of the universal virtues of love and good-neighborliness. (Comment by a Hindu)

While Buddhists and Hindus are permitted an interest in economic development, the essential power of their faith operates from the other side by way of holding economic desires in check, stressing the superiority of the spiritual over the material, the need for the renunciation of things.

The participants in the conference were told by Buddhists and Hindus that the affinity of their brothers in Asia for spiritual values had blessed them with the patience and strength to resist the blandishments of totalitarianism.

Here is a situation where a little more of the Hindu emphasis on contemplation and on withdrawal from the material pursuits of life can make a real contribution to human happiness. . . . The sacrifices that the rich must make for the eradication of poverty and want from this world would be forthcoming all the more if the distinctive Hindu emphasis on renunciation or re-education in material needs . . . gains larger currency. (Comment from a Hindu)

This has its point for comfortable Europeans and rich Americans, but doctrines of renunciation have relevance to only the small percentage of Buddhist and Hindu populations who have economic goods to renounce. For the great masses of Asians and Africans the struggle remains one of holding on to that minimum of bread and medicine that prevents death. When a Buddhist or a Hindu urges renunciation of the world, he is speaking mostly to the West. We have the right to wonder what modification will take place in the Oriental religions should a considerably higher standard of living become a reality for the masses of Asia.

Religions interact with their economic circumstances, as the history of Christianity testifies. From the beginning of the Christian era to the Commercial and Industrial Revolutions, saving was principally hoarding. Since that time, saving in a Western economy presents the possibility of capital formation, adding to the store of producers' goods which in turn may ease the lot of the poor. While a difference is discernible between the Protestant and the Catholic ethic with regard to the rise of capitalism, the great difference within the history of Christianity so far as its attitudes toward economic life are concerned is accounted for by changes in economic possibilities consequent upon technological development.

As the masses in Asia come within sight of more to eat and enjoy, there is a question of the modification that this may work in the doctrines of renunciation. But there is a more urgent question: Will the secular religion of communism, which on the basis of incomplete evidence shows the capacity to achieve in China a significantly greater acceleration of economic development than non-totalitarian methods have achieved in India, win converts for the religions of renunciation?

Common Ground: "All Have Sinned . . ."

Since the conference met on basically religious grounds, there were many currents and cross currents of religious sentiment and opinion. One of the most interesting to follow was the reactions of Buddhists, Hindus and Muslims to Christianity.

While they displayed no special esteem for the institutions of organized Christianity, they made a special point of expressing admiration for its founder who was frequently referred to as "Lord Christ" by the Buddhists, or "Jesus Christ" by the Muslims. The most frequently quoted scripture during the conference was ascribed to him: "What shall it profit a man if he gains the whole world and lose his own soul?"

The visitors were at pains to point out that their own faiths comprehend the teachings of Jesus Christ. A characteristic Muslim assertion was: "... Divine revelation has been vouchsafed to all peoples and we as Muslims accept the truth of all original revelation." A typical Hindu statement was: "The Hindus believe in Divine intervention in the affairs of man not just once but through a series of incarnations or manifestations of God on this earth." All three accepted their own image of Jesus Christ and their complaint was that Christians do not likewise accept Lord Buddha, Lord Krishna and the Prophet Mohammed.

But the representatives of these religions were no nearer to embracing Christianity than the Christians were to embracing their religions. They resisted any suggestion that the merit of a religion is to be measured by the riches or military power of the nation whose people adhere to it. It was suggested during the course of discussing a statement of consensus that the conference might say: "All the world religions have some form of the Golden Rule in their scriptures." Buddhists, Hindus and Muslims rejected this suggestion, holding that the Golden Rule is a descriptive phrase from Christian terminology. They did not deny that their own faiths contained similar principles but they did not wish them called by this title.

The rejection of organized Christianity also took the form of a protest by some non-Christians against Christian foreign missions. Their protest neglected the record of Jesus Christ and his injunction to his disciples to go into all the world and preach the Gospel. It also neglected the histories of religions which give evidence that men cannot believe until they have heard and that they do not usually hear without a preacher. The protest seemed also to do violence to their other ideas

of freedom. They would not dare to suggest that the communication of letters, learning or music should stop at national boundaries.

The keenest cut for Christians in the objection to foreign missions is the understanding by the non-Christian religionists that missions involve an assumption of personal superiority. Claims that missionaries believe they are making for Christ are heard as claims for the West, for the United States in the case of American missionaries.

The Apostle Paul was not the last to be concerned with how to "preach Christ and him crucified" without preaching something of himself. In the present time of nationalism and "national religious ideals," it is an urgent necessity for foreign missionaries to refine the preachings of the Christian Gospel so that the content of self, nation and culture is reduced to the lowest limit humanly possible. The indigenous Christian church, however small, has strengths in the modern setting that a church operated by foreign missionaries can never know. Furthermore, Christian foreign missions must be a two-way street and American churches that send missionaries to Asia must also receive Christian missionaries from Asia.

Humility is the greatest need of Christians in confrontation with those of other religious faiths. Christians are never more close to their Lord than in the confession that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." In this confession they seemed likewise on the best common ground with their neighbors from all the world.

PASSING PARADE

RUSSIA REVISITED—II

In our issue of October 19 we printed the first part of John Lawrence's impressions growing from a visit to Russia last summer. Mr. Lawrence is the editor of Frontier, in whose Autumn 1959 issue this article originally appeared.

Most Russians do not know what to think about the deeper things of this world and the next. Socialism is universally accepted in a general way, but few are interested in the rigors of Marxist analysis. Skepticism has fed on the many changes of the party line. Ordinary people are puzzled and are apt to shift their ground uneasily if they come up against firm convictions. I have been told that those party members who were sent to Siberia by Stalin and have returned are the most Leninist group in the Soviet Union. In exile, under Stalin, as in Tsarist days, the exiles met and talked and took stock of the world.

In Russia there is a passionate belief—or is it

only a longing to believe?—in the perfectibility of human society on this earth. To doubt this is to be "anti-human." To believe otherwise after all the sacrifices is too cruel for most Russians to contemplate, at least for those over thirty.

How can the Church come to grips with such a view, and how otherwise can she seem relevant to the felt needs of Soviet men and women? The Communist view of man and society takes no account of the hard facts of the fall, of man's tendency to sin. It is therefore tempting for Christians to say simply that the Marxist view is false and that the whole enterprise is doomed. No Communist government would allow this to be said in public and it might well be thought that in consequence the Church has withdrawn from society, placing its hopes on another world. It is true that the churches behind the iron curtain have no adequate doctrine of the relation of the Church to modern society.

A visitor on a first visit to Russia has written, "After a time I found even the churches depressing. With all their courage and beauty and wonderful ancient rites, their holy priests and the devotion of the faithful, they seem too still and perfect, as though covered with golden ice. I began to long for those boring notices to be given out . . . the pamphlets and notices and appeals for foreign missions and collecting boxes for good causes and the bad taste of our churches."

This is a shrewd criticism of the Russian Orthodox Church. It does not apply in the same way to the Baptists; they have the common touch in the best sense of the phrase, but they are withdrawn into themselves in much the same way. How, it will be asked, could it be otherwise under a Communist government?

Yet this way of looking at the facts of religion under communism is not adequate. Christians ought not to say there can be no "good society"; we do say that goodness cannot be separated from holiness. The Russian Church is not very explicit about social questions, but it shows men and women the way to holiness, which is the way to the transformation of society. Russian Christians lag behind in giving articulate expression to the ideas that are likely to convert secularized man, but a Russian Christian leader has said recently that in spite of all the anti-religious propaganda the Gospel is received more easily in Russian hearts than in the West.

I think this is true but it is God's poor in their myriads whom one sees in the churches. It is easier for them to go; they risk nothing by being seen regularly in church, whereas an intellectual might spoil his career. "How hard it is for a rich man. . ." Even so the number of intellectuals who go to church is growing and there are certainly believers who go to church on special days but find it more prudent not to go too often. However the great bulk of educated people is still untouched by religion and is likely to remain untouched until the Russian Christians learn to speak to them in terms that they can understand.

JOHN LAWRENCE

CORRESPONDENCE

A Word From the Pope Requested

TO THE EDITORS: Monsignor Lally ("Double Soliloquy is not Dialogue," Oct. 5) appears to resent Dr. Van Dusen's injection of the question of religious liberty into the dialogue. Rather, he seems to resent that Dr. Van Dusen does not say on this subject what he (Msgr. Lally) wants him to say.

Msgr. Lally is annoyed, as is Fr. Bernard Dauenhauer, that Protestants do not promptly accept the new, liberal Catholic view in regard to freedom for other churches. Come to think of it, much of the dialogue has been turning on what the Catholic Church does or does not teach on this issue. Why should there be so much confusion on the point? The Catholic Church is an authoritarian body and has a central leadership capable of making authoritative pronouncements. The statements of Fr. Murray, Fr. Ryan, Fr. Connell and many others are all interesting and relevant. Yet we know that one voice outspeaks them all.

All Msgr. Lally and his colleagues must do to silence their obtuse opposition is to come up with one unequivocal statement of the Pope that he believes in freedom for all churches. I made this challenge to Mr. Clancy in these columns. (Oct. 13, 1958) He cited (Oct. 27, 1958) one vague, emaciated utterance of Pius XII which, for all I could see, was no more than a reiteration of an idea we've heard before, that under certain conditions it may be justifiable not to impede error by coercive measures.

If the Pope does indeed believe in liberty for all faiths, why doesn't he just say so? That would

settle the matter and we wouldn't have to have all this pull and haul over what the Church does or does not teach on this point. There is, unfortunately, no such utterance on record. Fr. Murray's teaching has never gained acceptance at the Vatican. In fact, the last time this issue came to a head the Vatican (isn't that the Pope?) issued a statement that pronounced Cardinal Ottaviani's reactionary views to be "unexceptionable."

Until this public record has been publicly altered, Protestants are certainly justified in injecting into the dialogue this issue which, after all, is quite important to them.

C. STANLEY LOWELL, Associate Director
Protestants and Other Americans United
for Separation of Church and State
Washington, D.C.

CHURCH NEWS AND NOTES

New Era in Ecumenics Foreseen

Geneva—Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, said here recently that the ecumenical movement has moved into a new stage of development characterized by "extension, complication and development."

"The time is over when it was a movement of Christian people who had some general interest, some vague goodwill towards each other and some general hope that the Church would play its part in the world."

"We see that unity cannot be a unity that is empty," he declared. "It must at the same time be a unity that is renewal."

A Christmas Gift Should Fit

both the giver and the receiver. A most appropriate way to express your own concerns and your high regard for your friends is a gift subscription to *Christianity and Crisis* at our reduced Christmas rates.

The first gift: \$4.00

Additional gifts: \$3.50

And—if you order two or more—you may renew your own subscription for only \$3.50, a 30% reduction.

DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOOK RECEIVING DEPT
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH
37402 11-59

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR AND JOHN C. BENNETT, *Chairmen*
WAYNE H. COWAN, *Managing Editor*
M. SEARLE BATES WALDO BEACH AMOS WILDER
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOSEPH SITTLER HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER J. OSCAR LEE
KENNETH W. THOMPSON WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER M. M. THOMAS
JOHN BAILLIE WILLIAM F. MAY ROGER L. SHINN
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD

CONTENTS

WORLD RELIGION AND WORLD AFFAIRS

PAUL GEREN